

and may furnish the name and address of his agent or representative.”

Furnishing such certifications by anyone other than:

(i) The owner, charterer or master of a vessel, or

(ii) The insurer would fall within the prohibition set forth in §760.2(d) of this part, “unless it is clear from all the facts and circumstances that these certifications are not required for a boycott reason.” See §760.2(d) (3) and (4) of this part.

The Department has received from the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia a clarification that the shipping and insurance certifications are required by Saudi Arabia in order to:

(i) Demonstrate that there are no applicable restrictions under Saudi laws or regulations pertaining to maritime matters such as the age of the ship, the condition of the ship, and similar matters that would bar entry of the vessel into Saudi ports; and

(ii) Facilitate dealings with insurers by Saudi Arabian importers whose ability to secure expeditious payments in the event of damage to insured goods may be adversely affected by the absence of a qualified agent or representative of the insurer in Saudi Arabia. In the Department’s judgment, this clarification constitutes sufficient facts and circumstances to demonstrate that the certifications are not required by Saudi Arabia for boycott reasons.

On the basis of this clarification, it is the Department’s position that any United States person may furnish such shipping and insurance certificates required by Saudi Arabia without violating §760.2(d) of this part. Moreover, under these circumstances, receipts of requests for such shipping and insurance certificates from Saudi Arabia are not reportable.

It is still the Department’s position that furnishing such a certificate pertaining to one’s own eligibility offends no prohibition under part 760. See §760.2(f) of this part, example (xiv). However, absent facts and circumstances clearly indicating that the certifications are required for ordinary commercial reasons as demonstrated by the Saudi clarification, furnishing certifications about the eligibility or blacklist status of any other person would fall within the prohibition set forth in §760.2(d) of this part, and receipts of requests for such certifications are reportable.

It also remains the Department’s position that where a United States person asks an insurer or carrier of the exporter’s goods to self-certify, such request offends no prohibition under this part. However, where a United States person asks anyone other than an insurer or carrier of the exporter’s goods to self-certify, such requests will be considered by the Department as evidence of the requesting person’s refusal to do business with those persons who cannot or will not

furnish such a self-certification. For example, if an exporter-beneficiary of a letter of credit asks his component suppliers to self-certify, such a request will be considered as evidence of his refusal to do business with those component suppliers who cannot or will not furnish such a self-certification.

The Department wishes to emphasize that notwithstanding the fact that self-certifications are permissible, it will closely scrutinize the activities of all United States persons who provide such self-certifications, including insurers and carriers, to determine that such persons have not taken any prohibited actions or entered into any prohibited agreements in order to be able to furnish such certifications.

[61 FR 12862, Mar. 25, 1996, as amended at 65 FR 34949, June 1, 2000]

SUPPLEMENT NO. 3 TO PART 760— INTERPRETATION

Pursuant to Article 2, Annex II of the Peace Treaty between Egypt and Israel, Egypt’s participation in the Arab economic boycott of Israel was formally terminated on January 25, 1980. On the basis of this action, it is the Department’s position that certain requests for information, action or agreement which were considered boycott-related by implication now cannot be presumed boycott-related and thus would not be prohibited or reportable under the Regulations. For example, a request that an exporter certify that the vessel on which it is shipping its goods is eligible to enter Arab Republic of Egypt ports has been considered a boycott-related request that the exporter could not comply with because Egypt has a boycott in force against Israel (see 43 FR 16969, April 21, 1978 or the 15 CFR edition revised as of January 1, 1979). Such a request after January 25, 1980 would not be presumed boycott-related because the underlying boycott requirement/basis for the certification has been eliminated. Similarly, a U.S. company would not be prohibited from complying with a request received from Egyptian government officials to furnish the place of birth of employees the company is seeking to take to Egypt, because there is no underlying boycott law or policy that would give rise to a presumption that the request was boycott-related.

U.S. persons are reminded that requests that are on their face boycott-related or that are for action obviously in furtherance or support of an unsanctioned foreign boycott are subject to the Regulations, irrespective of the country or origin. For example, requests containing references to “blacklisted companies”, “Israel boycott list”, “non-Israeli goods” or other phrases or words indicating boycott purpose would be subject to the appropriate provisions of the Department’s antiboycott regulations.